UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,932	03/30/2004	Peter E. Hart	20412-08383	7930

758 7590 01/12/2007

FENWICK & WEST LLP
SILICON VALLEY CENTER
801 CALIFORNIA STREET
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041

EXAMINER	
THOMPSON, JAMES A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2625	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/814,932	HART ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James A. Thompson	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *9/18/06, 10/2/06, 10/16/06, 11/6/06*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-49 and 52-55* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-49 and 52-55* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 November 2005* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/2/06, 11/6/06*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 18 September 2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 18 September 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding page 11, lines 3-20: The present amendments to the claims have required new grounds of rejection, which are set forth in detail below.

Regarding page 11, line 21 to page 13, line 9: In the previous office action, dated 06 July 2006 and mailed 12 July 2006, Examiner clearly stated that the motivation for combining the references as set forth in the arguments regarding claims 1 and 41 "would have been to be able to automatically control the routing and processing of documents that are converted into digital format (para. 9, lines 1-8 of Constantin [US PGPub 2003/0002068 A1]), which is clearly advantageous over having to manually control the digital data input." Applicant incompletely quotes the portion of Constantin cited by Examiner. Paragraph 9 of Constantin states: "The present invention is directed to a flexible method and apparatus for control of the routing and processing of documents by a document-receiver. The sender need not know how the receiver classifies the document sent to him or anything about how the receiver intends to route or process the document. The document-receiver may easily establish and change document classifications and document routing and processing instructions." This cite from Constantin clearly and unambiguously supports Examiner's first stated motivation to combine Constantin with Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723). This automatic routing control and document processing is clearly advantageous over slow, manual routing control and document processing and would readily have been recognized by one skilled in the art to be an advantage to combining the teachings of Constantin with Sugiyama.

Secondly, the additional suggestion to combine the references states that a "further suggestion for combining would have been that the interface of Sugiyama requires a video signal input in order to have

data upon which to operate. The printing sub-system of Constantin simply provides the required video signal." In other words, one of ordinary skill in the art would immediately recognize that some digital input is necessary for the system of Sugiyama to function, and Sugiyama does not go into extensive detail about the input data. Thus, in light of the first motivation given, one of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized the additional need to provide an input for the system of Sugiyama. Coupled with the fact that Constantin also performs automated routing and document processing, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would clearly have seen that Constantin is a reference well-suited for combination with Sugiyama.

Finally, the Federal Circuit Court has held that "There are three possible sources of for a motivation to combine the references: the nature of the problem to be solved, the teachings of the prior art, and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art" [*In re Rouffet*, 149 F.3d 1350, 1357, 47 USPQ 2d 1453, 1457-58 (Fed. Cir. 1998)] and this is still the standard used in determining motivation/suggestion to combine references in an obviousness rejection [see MPEP §2143.01.I]. Examiner has provided motivation and suggestion to combine Constantin with Sugiyama from both the teachings of the prior art and the knowledge of persons of ordinary skill in the art, and has specifically set forth the motivation and suggestion to combine Constantin with Sugiyama.

Regarding page 13, line 10 to page 14, line 6: Applicant's arguments are directed to the proposed amendments to the claims, which have not been entered, and not the claims as presently recited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 16, 21, 24, 25, 41, 42, 47 and 52-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1) and Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532).

Regarding claims 1 and 41: Sugiyama discloses a system (figure 1 of Sugiyama) for printing (column 6, lines 19-26 of Sugiyama) time-based media data from a media source (column 3, lines 12-17 of Sugiyama), the system comprising an interface (figure 1(11) of Sugiyama) for receiving the time-based

media from a media source (column 3, lines 12-17 of Sugiyama); a multimedia processing system (figure 1(12-16,26,28-29) of Sugiyama) coupled to the interface to receive the time-based media (as clearly shown in figure 1 of Sugiyama), the multimedia processing system determining (column 3, lines 57-63 of Sugiyama) an electronic representation of the time-based media (figure 4 and column 4, lines 25-31 of Sugiyama); and a first output device (figure 1(18-20) of Sugiyama) in communication with the multi-media processing system to receive the electronic representation (as clearly shown in figure 1 of Sugiyama), the first output device producing a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the time-based media (figure 4 and column 4, lines 30–35 of Sugiyama). The multimedia processing system corresponds to the system shown in figure 1 of Sugiyama that performs the actual processing of the time-based media data. This excludes portions such as the video data interface (figure 1(11) of Sugiyama), the user interface (figure 1(21-25) of Sugiyama), the output printing system (figure 1(30-33) of Sugiyama), and the output display system (figure 1(18-20) of Sugiyama).

Sugiyama does not disclose expressly a printing sub-system for receiving and printing standard document formats, wherein said interface is physically coupled to said printing sub-system; and that said determination of an electronic representation is performed automatically.

Constantin discloses a printing sub-system for receiving and printing standard document formats (para. 26, lines 3-26 of Constantin), wherein said printing sub-system is physically coupled to an interface (para. 26, lines 14-20 of Constantin). Requiring that the document be scanned into computer and/or transmitted electronically to a web, email or network address (para. 26, lines 14-20 of Constantin) inherently requires that said printing sub-system be physically coupled to some sort of interface. Otherwise, there is no means by which the data can be transmitted.

Sugiyama and Constantin are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include an input from the printing sub-system taught by Constantin into the interface taught by Sugiyama. The interface taught by Sugiyama inputs a general video signal. The input that would be received from the printing sub-system of Constantin is simply a type of video signal to be input into said interface. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to automatically control the routing and processing of documents that are converted into digital format (para. 9, lines 1-8 of Constantin), which is clearly advantageous over having to manually control the digital data input. A further suggestion for combining would have been that the inter-face of Sugiyama requires a video signal input in order to have data upon which to operate. The printing sub-system of Constantin simply provides the required video signal. Therefore, it would have

been obvious to combine Constantin with Sugiyama.

Sugiyama in view of Constantin does not disclose expressly that said determination of an electronic representation is performed automatically.

Mochimaru discloses determining an electronic representation automatically (figures 13-14 and column 8, line 19 to column 9, line 15 of Mochimaru).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin is combinable with Mochimaru because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine an electronic representation, as taught by Sugiyama, automatically, as taught by Mochimaru. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve overall speed and performance by determining an electronic representation of a video image without requiring the direct input of a user, as taught by Sugiyama in view of Constantin. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mochimaru with Sugiyama in view of Constantin to obtain the invention as specified in claims 1 and 41.

Further regarding claim 41: The system of claim 1 performs the method of claim 41.

Regarding claim 2: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia processing system further determines a printed representation of the time-based media data (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 3: Sugiyama discloses a second output device (figure 1(31-33) of Sugiyama) in communication with the multimedia processing system to receive the printed representation (as clearly shown in figure 1 of Sugiyama), the second output device producing a corresponding printed output from the representation of the time-based media (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 16: Sugiyama discloses that the interface comprises a video port (figure 1("Video Signal") and column 3, lines 12-17 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claims 21 and 47: Sugiyama discloses that the media source comprises a video camcorder (column 3, lines 12-15 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 24: Sugiyama discloses that said multi-media processing system comprises a video stream processor (figure 1(15) and column 3, lines 26-32 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 25: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia processing system comprises a video key frames extractor (figure 1(12) and column 3, lines 20-29 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claim 42: Sugiyama discloses determining a printed representation of the time-based media (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama); and generating a corresponding printed output from the printed representation of the time-based media (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama).

Regarding claims 52 and 54: Sugiyama in view of Constantin does not disclose expressly that the first output device producing a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the time-based media comprises the first output device automatically producing a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the time-based media.

Mochimaru discloses an output device automatically producing a corresponding electronic output (figures 13-14 and column 8, line 19 to column 9, line 15 of Mochimaru).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin is combinable with Mochimaru because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the first output device produce a corresponding electronic output from the electronic representation of the time-based media, as taught by Sugiyama, automatically, as taught by Mochimaru. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve overall speed and performance by determining an electronic representation of a video image without requiring the direct input of a user, as taught by Sugiyama in view of Constantin. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mochimaru with Sugiyama in view of Constantin to obtain the invention as specified in claims 52 and 54.

Regarding claims 53 and 55: Sugiyama in view of Constantin does not disclose expressly that the printing subsystem for receiving and printing digital document formats comprises the printing sub-system for receiving and automatically printing standard document formats.

Mochimaru discloses a printing sub-system for receiving and automatically printing documents (figures 13-14 and column 8, line 19 to column 9, line 15 of Mochimaru).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin is combinable with Mochimaru because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the printing subsystem for receiving and printing digital document formats, as taught by Sugiyama, receive and automatically print, as taught by Mochimaru. The motivation for doing so would have been to improve overall speed and performance by determining an electronic representation of a video image without requiring the direct input of a user, as taught by Sugiyama in view of Constantin. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Mochimaru with Sugiyama in view of Constantin to obtain the invention as specified in claims 53 and 55.

5. **Claims 4-6, 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), and Wendelken (US Patent 6,193,658 B1).**

Regarding claim 4: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that the printed output is generated on a video paper.

Wendelken discloses generating a printed output on video paper (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Wendelken because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to specifically use video paper for the output print, as taught by Wendelken. The motivation for doing so would have been that video paper is one of several useful means for generating a permanent record of video image data (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wendelken with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

Regarding claims 5 and 43: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that the electronic output is stored on a media recorder.

Wendelken discloses storing an electronic output on a media recorder (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Wendelken because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store the electronic output on a media recorder, as taught by Wendelken. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to keep a permanent record of the video image data (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wendelken with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claims 5 and 43.

Regarding claims 6 and 44: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that the electronic output is stored on a removable storage device.

Wendelken discloses storing an electronic output on a removable storage device (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Video tapes and optical discs are clearly removable storage devices.

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Wendelken because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to store the electronic output on a removable storage device, as taught by Wendelken. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to keep a permanent record of the video image data (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken). Further, as is well-known in the art, using a *removable* storage device allows a user to switch recording devices, thus increasing the overall amount of data that can be stored and archived. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Wendelken with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claims 6 and 44.

6. **Claims 7 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), Wendelken (US Patent 6,193,658 B1), Hymel (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1) and Shieh (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0185533 A1).**

Further regarding claims 7 and 45: Wendelken discloses that said removable storage device (taught by Wendelken in the arguments regarding claims 6 and 44 above) is selected from one of a video tape and an optical disc (column 6, lines 32-34 of Wendelken).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru and Wendelken does not disclose expressly that the optical disc can specifically be either a DVD or a CD-ROM. Thus, Wendelken does not disclose expressly that the group from which said removable storage device is selected consists of not only a video tape, but also a DVD, a CD-ROM, an audio cassette tape, a flash card, a memory stick, and a computer disk.

Hymel discloses a removable storage device selected from among a video tape (as is well-known in the art, a digital camcorder uses a digital video (DV) cassette tape) (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 20 of Hymel), a DVD (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 20-21 of Hymel), a CD-ROM (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 19-20 of Hymel), an audio cassette tape (audio cassette tape reader is a type of audio player, MP3 player is merely an example) (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 19 of Hymel), and a computer disk (para. 19, lines 8-9 of Hymel).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru and Wendelken is combinable with Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a video cassette tape, a DVD, a CD-ROM, an audio cassette tape, and a computer disk. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a variety of different types of

peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru and Wendelken.

Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru, Wendelken and Hymel does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a DVD, a CD-ROM, an audio cassette tape, a video tape, and a computer disk, but also a flash card and a memory stick.

Shieh discloses removable storage devices including a flash card (para. 18, lines 1-5 of Shieh) and a memory stick (para. 18, lines 9-10 of Shieh).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru, Wendelken and Hymel is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a flash card and a memory stick, as taught by Shieh. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to output data to one of a plurality of different output devices, depending upon user need and desire (para. 18, lines 3-10 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru, Wendelken and Hymel to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7 and 45.

7. **Claims 8 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), and Chino (US Patent 6,118,888).**

Regarding claim 8: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that the interface comprises an ultrasonic pen capture device.

Chino discloses an ultrasonic pen capture device (figure 3 (102i) and column 7, lines 14-16 of Chino).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Chino because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to capture input data using an ultrasonic pen capture device, as taught by Chino. The suggestion for doing so would have been that an electronic pen is simply another useful output device that provides digital data a user may wish to obtain (figure 3 and column 6, lines 66-67 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

Regarding claim 38: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said multi-media processing system comprises an image detection system.

Chino discloses an image detection system (figure 1(101) and column 6, lines 36-40 of Chino).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Chino because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the image detection system taught by Chino as part of the overall multimedia processing system. The motivation for doing so would have been that detecting an image, in this case specific types of gazes, provides useful user input (column 6, lines 36-40 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 38.

Regarding claim 39: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said multi-media processing system comprises a face recognition system.

Chino discloses a face recognition system (figure 20(406) and column 24, lines 25–27 of Chino).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Chino because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the face recognition system taught by Chino as part of the overall multimedia processing system. The motivation for doing so would have been to determine which particular user corresponds to the current user by recognition of the current user's face (column 26, lines 20-22 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 39.

Regarding claim 40: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said multimedia processing system comprises a speech recognition system.

Chino discloses a speech recognition system (column 29, lines 45-47 of Chino).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Chino because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the speech recognition system taught by Chino as part of the overall multimedia processing system. The motivation for doing so would have been that human speech is a useful and natural form of user input (column 1, lines 15-18 of Chino). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chino with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 40.

8. Claims 9, 11, 12 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), and Shieh (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0185533 A1).

Regarding claim 9: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a parallel port.

Shieh discloses as part of the background an input interface that comprises a parallel port (para. 5, lines 7-8 of Shieh).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a parallel port for inputting the video data at said interface. The motivation for doing so would have been that parallel ports are compatible with flash card readers and the older 12 Mbit/sec computer equipment (para. 5, lines 1-9 of Shieh). Thus, using a parallel port is useful if older video and/or computer equipment is being used. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

Regarding claims 11-12: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a serial interface, wherein said serial interface is an USB interface.

Shieh discloses an interface comprising a serial interface, wherein said serial interface is an USB interface (figure 2 and para. 17, lines 12-15 of Shieh).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a USB interface for inputting the video data at said interface. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide an increased data transfer rate, as compared with the older types of data transfer ports (para. 5, lines 7-12 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claims 11-12.

Regarding claim 18: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a removable storage reader.

Shieh discloses an interface comprising a removable storage reader (para. 17, lines 1-3 of Shieh).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the

invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a removable storage reader as part of the interface, as taught by Shieh. The suggestion for doing so would have been that flash memory is applicable to various digital products (para. 5, lines 12-14 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

9. **Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), and Stevens (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0010641 A1).**

Regarding claim 10: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a wireless communication interface.

Stevens discloses an video data interface comprising a wireless communication interface (figure 3(110) and para. 36, lines 1-8 of Stevens).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Stevens because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a wireless communication interface as said interface, as taught by Stevens. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to retrieve desired distributions of audio and video data over a controlled broadcast (para. 4, lines 1-5 of Stevens). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Stevens with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

10. **Claims 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), and Leman (US Patent 5,436,792).**

Regarding claims 13-14: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises a docking station that is built into the system.

Leman discloses a docking station (column 3, lines 31-38 of Leman) that is built into the system (column 5, lines 53-61 of Leman).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Leman because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of digital data output and flow. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a docking station built

into the system, as taught by Leman, as part of the interface taught by Sugiyama. The motivation for doing so would have been that a docking station provides ease of connection and disconnection with external devices and peripherals (column 2, lines 6-11 of Leman). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Leman with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claims 13-14.

11. **Claims 15, 20, 22, 46 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), and Hymel (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1).**

Regarding claim 15: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said interface comprises an optical port.

Hymel discloses an interface that comprises an optical (infrared) port (para. 10, lines 13-14 of Hymel).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Hymel because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use an optical port as part of said interface. The suggestion for doing so would have been that an optical port is one of many types of useful data ports for transferring digital data (para. 10, lines 3-14 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

Regarding claims 20 and 46: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said media source comprises a cellular phone.

Hymel discloses a media source comprising a cellular phone (para. 10, lines 3-5 and lines 14-15 of Hymel).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Hymel because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a cellular phone as the media source. The suggestion for doing so would have been that a cellular phone is one of many types of useful media data input devices that can be used (para. 10, lines 14-22 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claims 20 and 46.

Regarding claims 22 and 48: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that the media source comprises a digital audio recorder.

Hymel discloses a media source comprising a digital audio recorder (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 19 of Hymel).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Hymel because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a digital audio recorder as the media source. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect another one of a variety of different types of peripheral devices, thus allowing the user to perform one more of a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claims 22 and 48.

12. Claims 17, 28-30 and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), and Dygert (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0048224 A1).

Regarding claim 17: Sugiyama discloses that the interface comprises a port for connecting to the peripheral device, the port selected from a group including composite video (luminance and chrominance signals) (column 3, lines 16-20 of Sugiyama) and component video (NTSC) (column 3, lines 12-14 of Sugiyama).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said group consists of not only composite video and component video, but also of SCSI, IDE, RJ11 and S-video.

Dygert discloses a port for connecting a peripheral device selected from one of SCSI (para. 50, lines 1-5 of Dygert), IDE (para. 50, lines 1-5 of Dygert), RJ11 (para. 27, lines 6-9 of Dygert) and S-video (para. 50, lines 9-15 of Dygert).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Dygert because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multimedia data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to be able to further select between SCSI, IDE, RJ11 and S-video ports. The suggestion for doing so would have been that said ports are among some of the many available types of ports for transferring time-based media data (para. 27, lines 3-9 and para. 50, lines 1-6 of Dygert). Therefore, it would have been obvious to

combine Dygert with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Regarding claims 28-29: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said multimedia processing system is configured to communicate with the media source.

Dygert discloses a multimedia processing system (figure 1 (10) of Dygert) that communicates with a media source (figure 1 (13); and para. 44, lines 1-2, lines 7-9 and lines 12-15 of Dygert), thus controlling the functionality of said media source (para. 44, lines 1-2, lines 7-9 and lines 12-15 of Dygert).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Dygert because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the multimedia processing system communicatively interact with the media source, as taught by Dygert. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to access a large, remote recording database (para. 11, lines 1-4 of Dygert) instead of having to store the entire digital media collection locally. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claims 28-29.

Regarding claim 30: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that the multimedia processing system resides at least in part on the media source.

Dygert discloses performing multimedia processing operations on the media source (para. 44, lines 7-9 and lines 12-15 of Dygert). Thus, the multimedia processing system resides at least in part on the media source.

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Dygert because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to operate the multimedia processing system at least partly on the media source, as taught by Dygert. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to access a large, remote recording database (para. 11, lines 1-4 of Dygert) instead of having to store the entire digital media collection locally. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 30.

Regarding claim 33: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that the interface comprises a database server.

Dygert discloses an interface (figure 1(28) of Dygert) comprising a database server (figure 1(13) and para. 27, lines 9-16 of Dygert).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Dygert because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a database server as part of said interface, as taught by Dygert. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to access a large, remote recording database (para. 11, lines 1-4 of Dygert) instead of having to store the entire digital media collection locally. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Dygert with Sugiyama in view of Constantin to obtain the invention as specified in claim 33.

Further regarding claim 34: Dygert discloses that said database server comprises a music catalog (figure 5 and para. 22, lines 1-4 of Dygert).

Further regarding claim 35: Dygert discloses that said database server comprises a video database (para. 22, lines 1-4 of Dygert).

13. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), Shieh (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0185533 A1), Hymel (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1), and Gerber (US Patent 5,568,406).

Further regarding claim 19: Shieh discloses that the removable storage reader comprises a media reader selected from a group, wherein two of said group is a flash card reader (para. 16, lines 1-3 of Shieh) and a memory stick reader (para. 18, lines 9-10 of Shieh).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru and Shieh does not disclose expressly that said group consists of not only a flash card reader, and a memory stick reader, but also a DVD reader, a CD reader, a computer disk reader, and an SD reader.

Hymel discloses a removable storage reader selected from among a DVD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 20-21 of Hymel), a CD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 19-20 of Hymel), and a computer disk reader (para. 19, lines 8-9 of Hymel).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru and Shieh is combinable with Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a DVD reader, a CD reader, and a computer disk reader, as taught by Hymel. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a variety of different types of peripheral devices

to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru and Shieh.

Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru, Shieh and Hymel does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a DVD reader, a flash card reader, a memory stick reader, a CD reader, and a computer disk reader, but also of an SD reader.

Gerber discloses storing digital data on an SD disk (column 10, lines 28-34 of Gerber).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru, Shieh and Hymel is combinable with Gerber because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection an SD disk. The motivation for doing so would have been that an SD disk is useful for backing up large amounts of digital data (column 10, lines 23-34 of Gerber). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Gerber with Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru, Shieh and Hymel to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

14. Claims 23 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), Shieh (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0185533 A1), Hymel (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1) and Heilweil (US Patent 4,881,135).

Regarding claims 23 and 49: Sugiyama discloses that the media source comprises a media input selected from a group of a video cassette tape reader (column 3, lines 12-15 of Sugiyama), and a video capture device (column 3, lines 12-15 of Sugiyama).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a video cassette tape reader and a video capture device, but also of a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, a flash card reader, a digital video recorder, and a meeting recorder.

Shieh discloses inputting digital media using a flash card reader (para. 16, lines 1-3 of Shieh).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Shieh because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control and storage of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a flash card reader, as taught by Shieh. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the user to input data to one of a plurality of different input devices, depending upon user need and desire

(para. 18, lines 3-10 of Shieh). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Shieh with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru.

Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru and Shieh does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a video cassette tape reader, a video capture device, and a flash card reader, but also of a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, a digital video recorder, and a meeting recorder.

Hymel discloses a media input device selected from among a DVD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 20-21 of Hymel), a CD reader (para. 10, lines 14-15 and lines 19-20 of Hymel), an audio cassette tape reader (audio cassette tape reader is a type of audio player, MP3 player is merely an example) (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 19 of Hymel), and a digital video recorder (para. 10, lines 14-15 and line 20 of Hymel).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru and Shieh is combinable with Hymel because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, and a digital video recorder, as taught by Hymel. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow a user to connect a variety of different types of peripheral devices to an overall system, thus allowing the user to perform a variety of functions (para. 2, lines 1-6 of Hymel). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hymel with Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru and Shieh.

Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru, Shieh and Hymel does not disclose expressly that said group consists not only of a DVD reader, a CD reader, an audio cassette tape reader, a video cassette tape reader, a video capture device, a flash card reader, and a digital video recorder, but also of a meeting recorder.

Heilweil discloses media input using a meeting recorder (figure 2 and column 3, lines 48–51 of Heilweil).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru, Shieh and Hymel is combinable with Heilweil because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control of data storage and output. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have available for selection the meeting recorder taught by Heilweil. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide audio-visual data regarding a conference or a meeting in a concealed or discreet manner (column 2, lines 33-40 of Heilweil). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Heilweil with

Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru, Shieh and Hymel to obtain the invention as specified in claims 23 and 49.

15. **Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), and Ohnishi (US Patent 4,807,186).**

Regarding claim 26: Sugiyama discloses that the multimedia processing system generates digital printed data (column 4, lines 35-42 of Sugiyama) corresponding to a video segment in the video stream (column 3, lines 26-32 of Sugiyama).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said digital printed data is specifically a bar code.

Ohnishi discloses printing digital data as a bar code (column 2, lines 56-60 of Ohnishi).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Ohnishi because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to print a video segment in the video stream, as taught by Sugiyama, as a bar code, as taught by Ohnishi. The suggestion for doing so would have been that a bar code is one of the convenient means by which digital data is stored and later read (column 2,lines 56-62 of Ohnishi). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ohnishi with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 26.

16. **Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), and Huberman (US Patent 6,115,718).**

Regarding claim 27: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that the multi-media processing system is configured to generate a web page representation of the multi-media.

Huberman discloses generating a web page representation of multimedia data (column 3, lines 30-38 of Huberman). For a web page to exist with multi-media data (column 3, lines 30-38 of Huberman), it is inherent that said web page is generated. Otherwise, said web page would not exist.

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Huberman because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the

time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to generate a web page representation of the multi-media, as taught by Huberman. The suggestion for doing so would have been that storing data on the world wide web allows a company, educational institution, or other entity to publicly store and allow others to access digital data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Huberman with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 27.

17. Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), and Schroath (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0169849).

Regarding claim 31: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that the multi-media processing system is configured to automatically detect a communicative coupling of the media source.

Schroath discloses automatically detecting a communicative coupling of a media source (para. 38, lines 14-18 of Schroath).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to configure the multi-media processing system taught by Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to automatically detect a communicative coupling of the media source, as taught by Schroath. The motivation for doing so would have been that, by using an automatic detection, digital data can be downloaded without querying the user (para. 38, lines 14–18 of Schroath), thus providing greater convenience for the user and faster downloads for required digital data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schroath with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 31.

Regarding claim 32: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that the multi-media processing system is configured to automatically download multi-media data from the media source.

Schroath discloses automatically downloading digital data from a media source (para. 38, lines 14-18 of Schroath).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the

invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to configure the multi-media processing system taught by Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to automatically download digital data from a media source, as taught by Schroath, wherein said digital data is the multi-media data taught by Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru. The motivation for doing so would have been that automatically downloading digital data without querying the user (para. 38, lines 14–18 of Schroath) provides greater convenience for the user and faster downloads for required digital data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Schroath with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 32.

18. **Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), Dygert (US Patent Application Publication 2002/0048224 A1), and Huberman (US Patent 6,115,718).**

Regarding claim 36: Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru and Dygert does not disclose expressly that the database server comprises a web search engine.

Huberman discloses searching with a web search engine (column 8, lines 44-49 of Huberman).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru and Dygert is combinable with Huberman because they are from similar problem solving areas, namely the control, storage and output of digital media data. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include a web search engine as part of the database, as taught by Huberman. The motivation for doing so would have been that a web search engine can lead a user to an appropriate web page containing the data desired. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Huberman with Sugiyama in view of Constantin, Mochimaru and Dygert to obtain the invention as specified in claim 36.

19. **Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiyama (US Patent 5,633,723) in view of Constantin (US Patent Application Publication 2003/0002068 A1), Mochimaru (US Patent 5,432,532), and Klatt (US Patent 4,754,485).**

Regarding claim 37: Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru does not disclose expressly that said multi-media processing system comprises a text-to-speech system.

Klatt discloses a text to speech system (figure 1 and column 3, lines 47-52 of Klatt).

Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru is combinable with Klatt because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely the control, processing and output of digital multi-media data. At the

time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the text-to-speech system taught by Klatt as part of said multi-media processing system. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide phonetic output for ASCII-based media input (column 1, line 67 to column 2, line 1 of Klatt). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Klatt with Sugiyama in view of Constantin and Mochimaru to obtain the invention as specified in claim 37.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James A. Thompson whose telephone number is 571-272-7441. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James A. Thompson
Examiner
Technology Division 2625

30 December 2006

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER